

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA  
NORTHERN DIVISION

KEVIN JACKSON,	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	CIVIL ACTION NO.
v.	)	2:18-CV-659-RAH-CSC
	)	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

**ORDER**

On June 15, 2021, the Magistrate Judge filed a Recommendation (Doc. 12) to which no timely objections have been filed. Upon an independent review of the record and upon consideration of the Recommendation, it is ORDERED that

- (1) The Recommendation (Doc. 12) is ADOPTED; and
- (2) The § 2255 motion is DENIED, and this case is DISMISSED with prejudice.

Furthermore, a certificate of appealability will not be issued. For a petitioner to obtain a certificate of appealability, he must make “a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). This showing requires that “reasonable jurists could debate whether (or, for that matter, agree that) the petition should have been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further.” *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). And, where a petition is denied on procedural grounds, he “must show not only that one or more of the claims he has raised presents a substantial constitutional issue, but also that there is a substantial issue about the

correctness of the procedural ground on which the petition was denied.” *Gordon v. Sec’y, Dep’t of Corrs.*, 479 F.3d 1299, 1300 (11th Cir. 2007) (citations omitted). “A ‘substantial question’ about the procedural ruling means that the correctness of it under the law as it now stands is debatable among jurists of reason.” *Id.*

Because reasonable jurists would not find the denial of Petitioner’s § 2255 petition debatable, a certificate of appealability is DENIED.

DONE, on this the 21st day of July, 2021.

/s/ R. Austin Huffaker, Jr.  
R. AUSTIN HUFFAKER, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE